## RECEIVED

330106

001 05 2001

5	ALAN BACOCK: I'm Alan Bacock, for the Big
6	Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens Valley. These are
7	comments on behalf our tribe.
8	On August 21, 2001 the DOE issued a notice
9	in the Federal Register on the planned Yucca Mountain
10	Site Recommendation Consideration Hearings and End of
11	Public Comment Period, together with an announcement of
12	the availability of the Yucca Mountain PSSE. The
13	announcement states that the PSSE contains a preliminary
14	evaluation of the suitability of the Yucca Mountain site
15	for development as a geologic repository based on the
16	DOE's proposed site suitability regulations, to be
17	codified as 10 CFR 963. Since the DOE has an existing
18	set of site suitability regulations, codified as 10 CFR
19	960, please explain why the DOE is not evaluating the
20	Yucca Mountain site under those regulations, and
21	providing the public the opportunity to see the DOE's
22	evaluation of the site under those regulations.
23	The Tribe finds that basing an evaluation
24	of the Yucca Mountain site on proposed regulations, when
25	there are existing regulations that have gone through

,

- the public notice and comment process and have been 1
- 2 codified since 1984, violates not only the
- 3 Administrative Procedures Act, but also the public
- 4 trust. Therefore, the Tribe insists the DOE immediately
- 5 suspend the current notice that is in the Federal
- 6 Register, conduct an evaluation of the Yucca Mountain
- 7 site under the 10 CFR 960 guidelines, and publish the
- 8 results of that evaluation in the Federal Register for
- 9 public review and comment.
- 10 The PSSE fails to include the
- 11 transportation of spent nuclear fuel and high-level
- 12 waste to the proposed Yucca Mountain repository. The
- 13 Draft Environmental Impactment Statement for the
- 14 Geologic Repository for the Disposal of Spent Nuclear
- 15 Fuel and High-Level Radioactive Waste (DEIS) previously
- 16 submitted by the DOE identifies the transportation of
- 17 spent nuclear fuel and high-level waste as one component
- 18 necessary for a repository. Therefore, transportation
- 19 is a connected action and should be considered an
- 20 integral part of the PSSE.
- 21 The DOE identified and evaluated potential
- 22 highway and rail routes within the state of Nevada in
- 23 1986. DOE's 1986 Environmental Assessment for Yucca

	24	Mountain and candidate sites in four other states
	25	concluded that Yucca Mountain was the worst possible
0017	7	
	1	location from a transportation perspective. DOE
	2	documented that Yucca Mountain had the poorest access to
	3	the National Interstate Highway and Mainline Railroad
	4	Networks, and the most difficult rail access
	5	construction requirements. DOE's 1986 Comparative
	6	Analysis also showed that the selection of Yucca
	7	Mountain would result in the highest cross-country
	8	transportation requirements, highest total
	9	transportation costs, and the highest projected number
	10	of transportation accident injuries and fatalities.
	11	The final Environmental Impact Statement
	12	for the Yucca Mountain project is not yet available.
	13	The DEIS, issued in July 1999, elicited approximately
	14	11,000 comments that have not been addressed.
	15	Tribes have set aside a lot of time and
	16	energy to participate in the suitability of the Yucca
	17	Mountain project, yet we have received no response from
	18	the DOE on our comments to the DEIS and our significant
	19	concerns have not been addressed. It now appears that

20 our comments to the DEIS are considered irrelevant due

21	to the fact that the Secretary of Energy may recommend
22	the Yucca Mountain site regardless of the DEIS. Tribes
23	cannot have confidence in an agency that seems to
24	consider approval of the Yucca Mountain site a foregone
25	conclusion without tribal input.
0018	
1	The DOE, according to the DEIS, has not yet
2	chosen a preferred design alternative, therefore, the
3	DEIS cannot adequately assess the potential
4	environmental impacts of a nuclear waste repository at
5	Yucca Mountain. How can the DOE describe what the
6	impacts will be when it does not even know what the
7	design of the repository will be? How can the president
8	and congress and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission make
9	informed decisions about whether or not to recommend and
10	license Yucca mountain as the site for a nuclear waste
11	repository if it is not clear what it will look like and
12	how hot it will be? The DOE has a responsibility to
13	choose a design alternative and describe what the
14	impacts of that chosen design will be on the environment
15	and on public health and safety. Since the DEIS was
16	published, the DOE has explored design alternatives that
17	are not even described in the DEIS. The Secretary of

18	Energy should choose its design for Yucca Mountain,
19	clearly describe it and accurately assess the impacts in
20	the DEIS before submitting a recommendation for site
21	development to the president.
22	The Big Pine Paiute Tribe of the Owens
23	Valley does not believe that Secretary of Energy Spencer
24	Abraham should proceed with a recommendation to develop
25	a nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain. According
0019	
1	to a DOE news bulletin on Tuesday, August 21, 2001
2	entitled "Secretary Abraham Reaffirms the Department of
3	Energy's Government-Government Relations with American
4	Indian Tribal Governments" it quotes Secretary Abraham
5	as saying that "we must include tribal participation in
6	the decision making process where our action may impact
7	their environmental and cultural interest." If
8	Secretary Abraham determines that the Yucca Mountain
9	site is suitable without addressing previous concerns by
10	Tribes, then the United States federal government has
11	failed to meet its trust responsibility with Native
12	American governments. Native American concerns must be
13	addressed before submitting a recommendation to the
14	president. Our people have called this beautiful part

- 15 of the United States home for generations and we are the
- 16 people who will have to live with the effects of a
- 17 poorly planned nuclear repository at Yucca Mountain

10/05/01

Page 6